

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Hightower for the very helpful and courteous discussions she had with Applicants' U.S. representative on June 16, 2005. At that time, Applicants' U.S. representative presented arguments that the block sulfonated polyimide composition as presently claimed is not obvious over the cited references because the cited references do not teach or suggest the presently claimed block sulfonated polyimide species. Specifically, Applicants' U.S. representative noted that the process for forming the specific block sulfonated polyimide composition is not taught or suggested by the cited references which describe a process for forming random polyimide compositions. Further, Applicants' U.S. representative noted that the claimed block sulfonated polyimide composition gives superior mechanical properties compared to the random sulfonated polyimide composition described in the cited references (as noted on pages 14-15 and 54-55 of the specification).

The Examiner indicated that the arguments discussed above and amendment of the previously presented claims to include the limitations of Claim 3 into Claim 1 to give the presently claimed composition would overcome the current rejection (see Interview Summary dated June 16, 2005). As the Examiner will note, Claim 1 has been amended accordingly and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness rejections of the claims over U.S. 6,425,944, U.S. 6,245,881 and U.S. 6,376,129.

In addition, Claim 29 has been amended to correct the typographical error.

In light of the above remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
DKD/rac


Donald K. Drummond, Ph.D.
Registration No. 52,834